

## **Task Force on the Future for Growth and Development in Maryland**

**August 12, 2008 / 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM**

**The Maryland Department of Planning**

**Baltimore, Maryland**

### **Meeting Summary**

#### **Attendance**

*Members:* Jon Laria (Chair), David Beall, Karl Brendle, David Carey, Sandy Coyman, Jan Gardner, Carol Gilbert, Teena Green, Richard Hall, David Jenkins, Brigid Kenney, Gerrit Knaap, Dru Schmidt-Perkins,

*Attendees:* Marty Baker (MDOT), Jamie Bridges (BMC), Candace Donoho (MML), Cristen Flynn(DLS), Landra Jones (Lt. Gov's Office), Les Knapp (MACo), Steve Lafferty (Delegate), Katie Maloney (Builders Association), Susan Mitchell (MAR), Sandi Olek (DNR), John Papagni (DHCD), Izzy Patoka (Governors Office) , Frank Principe (Balto. Co. Govt.), Caroline Varney-Alvarado (DHCD)

*MDP Staff:* Kiman Choi, Amanda Conn, Peter Conrad, David Costello, Arabia Davis, Nicole Diehlmann, Jenny King, Stephanie Martins, Marco Merrick, Matt Power, Sharon Reichlyn, Pat Russell, Shelley Wasserman, Bihui Xu

#### **Welcome/Administrative Matters**

Mr. Jon Laria, the Chair opened the meeting and thanked everyone for their attendance.

Mr. Laria briefed the group on an August 8, 2008 meeting with Ms. Helga Weschke and Ms. Rhonda Ray of the Department of Business and Economic Development (DBED). Although DBED is not formally on this Task Force they are very interested in trying to connect the Task Force's mission with their programs and will be drafting a memo on DBED's ability to connect with the Task Force's work.

Mr. Hall announced that the Listening Sessions planning are well underway. The Sessions are scheduled for six dates throughout the month of September and will be held in various places around the State. The format will begin with a brief regional background and an update on the Task Force's status. A moderator will then pose questions for the attendees to react to and comment. This will also include time for attendees to use electronic clickers to respond to a series of questions. At the end of the meeting topic tables will be open to attendees to further communicate their thoughts.

Mr. Hall noted that early next week Task Force members will receive an agenda, format details, questions and table topics. He also mentioned that the evening will also include a mapping exercise to give attendees the opportunity to graphically place a dot in areas where they feel growth should and should not be directed.

More information can be found about the Listening Sessions on MDP's website at:

<http://www.mdp.state.md.us>. Marco Merrick, Director of Communications for MDP will send out

Listening Session flyers and information for the Task Force to distribute. Mr. Merrick also noted that the Central Maryland location originally scheduled at Milford Mill High School has been changed to Woodlawn High School. The Task Force was encouraged but not required to attend some of these Listening Sessions. Mr. Hall committed to distributing the questions that will be discussed at the Listening Sessions to the Task Force for their feedback within the next two weeks.

Ms. Gilbert suggested that Prince George's County be added to the Listening Sessions locations.

Mr. Laria informed the Task Force of some administrative matters:

Mr. Laria reminded the Task Force about additions to the meeting schedule. Some members have expressed their concerns with the new meeting dates which have been recently added. Unfortunately, with such a huge charge, the Task Force needed to include more meeting dates, which have inconvenienced some of the members. Mr. Laria noted that he would try to schedule meetings in advance and attempt to accommodate as many members as possible.

Mr. Laria also announced that MDOT's representative, Caitlin Rayman, will no longer serve on the Task Force due to other obligations at MDOT and Don Halligan's return to the agency; Don, Director of Planning & Capital Improvements, will serve as MDOT's representative. Mr. Laria praised Ms. Rayman's contributions to the Task Force and welcomed Don's expected contributions.

Mr. Hall also introduced Peter Conrad, now head of local planning at MDP.

#### Parameters: State Transportation Plan

Marty Baker, MDOT, circulated an updated outline of the parameters for a State Transportation Plan. It was noted that such a transportation plan would elaborate on the land use element. She informed the Task Force that MDOT is currently in the process of updating the Maryland Transportation Plan (MTP) and that the future State Development Plan would be a sister document to the MTP. The State Development Plan's elaboration of Areas of Critical State Concern, an added layer of analysis, will inform MDOT's capital program decision making and that it will serve as a great resource for the locals. Additionally, in order to facilitate the State Development Process, MDOT is bringing in consultants and various resources to assist with the Plan.

Ms. Baker explained the highlights of the outline:

- Overview: Demonstrate the importance of the transportation plan and smart growth.
- Current Status/Analysis: This section details the primary requirements of the statute such as circulation patterns which can be married to MDP's travel pattern data and other MDOT data.
  - This section also will summarize the more intensive planning- help locals with their development plans.
  - Sister agencies will also be able to know what MDOT is doing.
  - Address smart growth requirements with regard to MDOT's capital spending.
- Challenges/Issues: Focus on capital spending, PFA shortcomings related to major transportation decision making.
- Recommendations/Next Steps: Transportation planning coordination to inform MDOT's review of local comprehensive plans.

Ms. Gardner asked if MDOT sends someone to the local jurisdiction during the comprehensive planning process. Ms. Baker responded that occasionally the local jurisdiction does invite MDOT, but that unless they were invited, MDOT does not get involved in the process.

Mr. Laria commended MDOT for its work and asked about the process for MDOT from this point forward. Ms. Baker explained that MDOT has consultant resources and will work with MDP to formulate this component of the overall State Development Plan (SDP). The SDP will be a sister document to the MTP and the SDP will reference the MTP and Attainment Report. Over the next few months, more substance will be added to the outline.

Mr. Laria noted the three tiered approach concerning growth areas in the MDOT materials and suggested that this framework should be discussed by the Task Force.

Ms. Schmidt-Perkins commented that as she reviewed the outline, she failed to see the connection to achieving goals. She pointed out that Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), Climate Change and high gas prices for example seem to be missing. It was suggested to re-enter the goals into the transportation section and to make them specific rather than using “lofty” language such as “promote..”. She further noted that plans should allow the reader to evaluate and guide and ultimately hold those accountable.

Mr. Laria encouraged the Task Force to provide MDOT with additional constructive feedback.

Mr. Coyman noted that there is a lot of literature available on goals, objectives that can help in the writing of a State Development Plan.

Ms. Schmidt-Perkins asked how the public participation process will be implemented. Mr. Hall explained that in early-mid 2009 the Plan would be put out for public feedback.

### 8 Visions Workgroup

Mr. Knaap gave an update on the 8 Visions workgroup meeting. The goals and visions from counties and municipalities were reviewed. Nicole Diehlmann, MHT and Joe Tassone, MDP have offered to draft and update the Visions.

Mr. Hall asked to what degree the workgroup discussed the 8 Visions -- as changes just to Article 66B or more broadly as to what Marylanders think about the Visions and their role as a statement for other purposes.

Mr. Laria stated that it would be unavoidable to tackle the broader issue, but also to focus on their role in Article 66B.

Ms. Wasserman interjected that the language (Visions) is not only in Article 66B but is also in MDP’s enabling legislation. They are not called “Visions” but instead are MDP’s policies; therefore the effect would extend beyond 66B.

Ms. Gilbert suggested the workgroup develop a draft that the Task Force felt comfortable distributing, then if at that time, it was broad enough people could comment on these Visions at the Listening Sessions.

Ms. Baker noted that the Visions, with any revisions, should be incorporated into the SDP.

#### Infrastructure Assessment Workgroup

Mr. Coyman thanked Arabia Davis, MDP for all her hard work and presented findings from the Infrastructure Assessment Workgroup. He explained that there is an \$8 billion need for infrastructure. There is a huge difference between demand and funding and it should be decided to what degree the locals are willing to pay. One avenue of funding is to put greater pressure at the federal level.

Mr. Beall asked why those in the rural areas should have to pay the same when the majority of the users are in urban areas. Mr. Coyman responded that those points are very legitimate and they need to be discussed.

Mr. Coyman requested that the workgroup be given a little more time to provide some additional clarification. He asked that the Task Force accept these initial findings as an initial draft. He also suggested the Task Force take a look at this document and make comments and suggestions as needed. Comments were to be forwarded to Ms. Davis by August 25, 2008.

#### Terrapin Run Workgroup

The workgroup made three alternative recommendations for consideration by the Task Force: (1) write an “ode” to the comprehensive plan which reiterates the importance of the comprehensive plan as one of the most important planning tools; (2) Clarify the special exception language; or (3) Make targeted revisions to the law. (The workgroup’s memo is included in Task Force materials)

The Task Force concluded that, if the court’s decision does compromise the accepted role of the comprehensive plan, the Task Force should take a firm stand in defense of the plans’ role. The Task Force decided, however, not to draft specific legislation but rather to make a strong recommendation that legislative action be taken to clarify the plans’ role and the historically understood requirement that land use decisions be truly consistent with the plan. Some members expressed concern, however, that the recommendation not overreach. Commissioner Jan Gardner, representing MACO, objected to supporting an open ended recommendation for legislative action. Mr. Laria suggested that a specific statement be drafted for final review by the Task Force consistent with the above.

#### Recommendation Focus Areas

Mr. Laria said he intended to identify 2-4 focus areas for more detailed discussion by the Task Force, and invited members to suggest such focus areas to him for consideration.

The meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m.

-----